UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/799,543	03/11/2004	Ke Han	13361-072001 / MP0413	7807	
26200 FISH & RICHA	7590 11/23/200 ARDSON P.C.	EXAMINER			
P.O BOX 1022		FOTAKIS, ARISTOCRATIS			
MINNEAPOLI	S, MN 55440-1022		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2611		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			11/23/2009	ELECTRONIC	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/799,543	HAN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	ARISTOCRATIS FOTAKIS	2611				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED <u>09 November 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.				
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request			
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	n.			
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (l MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f		FIRST REPLY WAS FI	LED WITHIN TWO			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extrunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the slaset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount on the nortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as			
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl	iance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be f	iled within two month	s of the date of			
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS			e appeal. Since a			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	ut prior to the date of filing a brief,	will <u>not</u> be entered be	cause			
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further con	•	E below);				
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	er form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for			
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reig	octed claims				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally reje	cied ciaims.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1 See attached Notice of Non-Co.	mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324)			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mphane / amonamone (	1 1 0 2 0 2 1 //			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be alk	<del></del>	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the			
non-allowable claim(s).		<b>,</b>				
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:						
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to ov showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail	s to provide a			
<ul> <li>0. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.</li> <li>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ul>						
<ul> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ul>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:			
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (label{eq:disclosure Statement}).	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)					
/CHIEH M FAN/	/Aristocratic Estakis/					
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2611	/Aristocratis Fotakis/ Examiner, Art Unit 2611					
•	Examinot, Art Offic 2011					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicants submit that Cideciyan does not teach of a branch metric generator that generates branch metrics comprising the cross-correlation term, which is referred to as the data-dependent or time varying term. Cideciyan's discloses that the branch metrics are used by an add-compare-select component and are not the same as branch metrics used by a branch metric generator

Examiner submits that Cideciyan teaches of branch metrics in a Viterbi detection. Cideciyan's discloses that the branch metrics are used by an add-compare-select component as being the next step of Viterbi detection in order to get the path metrics. The skilled artisan would recognize that the branch metrics where generated or calculated by a device or unit.

Applicants submit that Cideciyan does not describe determining an input sequence of the partial response channel by maximizing cross-correlation of an estimated output sequence with the obtained output sequence. Minimizing the metric of equation 3 in Cideciyan is not equivalent to determining an input sequence of the partial response channel by maximizing cross-correlation of an estimated output sequence with the obtained output sequence, because Cideciyan is still determining the constants.

Examiner submits that equation 3 in Cideciyan has a data dependent term and a constant term. Since the constant never changes, in order to minimize the metric and the only term that changes is the data dependent term (cross correlation with a negative sign), it would be required to maximize the cross-correlation.

Applicants submit that claim 21 uses "means for" language. The Office has failed to comply with this legal requirement, making no effort to identify how the claim language has been interpreted to read on only the structures disclosed in the specification or equivalents thereof.

Examiner submits that the specification or the Figures do not show of any structure for the Viterbi detection. It is not clear from Applicants disclosure if any structures in the Viterbi detection system are used in order to perform the Viterbi method described..